A BILL TO AMEND THE HIGH COURT REGULATION (I of 1067).

Mr. Vieyra. —From the Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to the High Court Regulation Amendment Bill, it will be seen that the Bill was the result of the modifications proposed in the Civil Courts Regulation Amendment Bill whereby the work of the High Court would have been considerably lightened. It was therefore proposed to reduce the number of Judges in the High Court. Now that the Civil Courts Bill has been thrown out, it is not possible to proceed further with the other Bill. I therefore move, under Section 34 of the Rules, for permission to withdraw the Bill to amend the High Court Regulation.

Seconded by Mr. Govinda Pillai.

Permission was granted accordingly.

CANALS AND PUBLIC FERRIES BILL.

Mr. Ananda Row.—I beg to propose that the report of the Select Committee on the Canals and Public Ferries Bill be taken up for consideration.

Both the report and the amended Bill have been published in the Gazette and copies circulated among the members. Notice of certain amendments has been given by some of the members and the same may be considered in the order of the sections to which they relate.

Seconded by Mr. Raman Tampi.

The motion was put and agreed to.

Mr. Ananda Row.—The first motion is that of Mr. Raman Tampi to abandon this Bill. So far as this Bill is concerned, I may mention that the principle was unanimously affirmed at the meeting of the Council held on 24th July last. This motion will, therefore, go against the sense of the Council and against the spirit of Sections 28 and 46 of the Rules.

Mr. Raman Tampi.—The first question is whether I am in order in making this motion. The objection is based upon Sections 28 and 46, para 2, of the Council Rules. But we have to interpret these rules consistently with the other provisions contained therein. No one can deny that the Council has the inherent power to drop a Bill at any stage. I therefore request that my motion be allowed.

Mr. Kuruvila.—I beg to second and support the motion of Mr. Raman Tampi.

The President.—The point for decision now is whether Mr. Raman Tampi is in order in moving that the Canals and Public Ferries Bill be abandoned. After reading the provisions of the rules bearing on the question and from what I have heard now, it seems to me that the Council has always two opportunities in the case of every Bill for voting upon it as a whole. The first occasion is when leave is applied for, for introducing a Bill. It is open to the Council then to either grant or refuse permission. The next opportunity is when the principle of the Bill is discussed in Council. If the Council think that a measure of the kind proposed is not necessary, the Bill can be thrown out. That being so, in the absence of any specific authorisation permitting a member to move at an intermediate stage that a Bill be thrown out, I do not think that this motion can be considered to be in order. I must therefore refuse Mr. Raman Tampi permission to make the motion.

Mr. Ananda Row.—The amendments of which notice has been given have now to be considered. The first amendment is in the definition of the term "Ferry" to be proposed by Mr. Kuruvila.

The President.—Before proceeding to that amendment, I would invite the attention of the Council to the definition of the term "Channel." The language as it stands at present may, I fear, lend itself to the interpretation that private waterways and private canals are contemplated to be brought within the scope of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly